necessity of these Atheists is not one and the same, but of two different kinds; some of them suppos ing a necessity of dead and stupid matter, which is that, which is commonly meant by vXuo?- ava-y/e??, or material necessity, and is also called by Aristo-itle, an absolute necessity of things; others, the necessity of a plastic life, which the same Aristotle calls an hypothetical necessity. For the Anaxi-mandrianand Dempcritic Atheists do both of them assert a material and absolute necessity of all things; one in the way of qualities, and the other of motion and mechanism: but the Stoical and Stratonical Atheists assert a plastical and hypothetical' necessity of things only.

Now one grand difference betwixt these two sorts of Atheisms and their necessities lies in this, that the former, though they make all things necessary, yet they suppose them also to be fortuitous; there being no inconsistency between the^e two. And the sense of both the Anaximandrian and Democri tic% Atheisms seems to be thus described *by PlatO,[a] *Trdvra Kara TV^y* !£ avay/ci/c *GVVE-KtpdaOrj,* All things were mingled together by necessity according to fortune.—For that nature, from whence these Atheists derived all things, |*m* at once both necessary and fortuitous; But tfcle Plastic Atheisms suppose such a necessary nature for the first principle of, things, as is not merely fortuitous, but regular, orderly, and methodical; the Stoical excluding all chance and fortune universally, because they subject all things to one plastic nature ruling over the .whole universe, but tfe Stratonical doing it in part only, because they

[?] De Legibus, lib. x. p. 666. oper.